

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

RAMAN VOJNIKA,

Plaintiff,

v

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE  
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant-Appellee

and

PROTECTIVE INSURANCE & FINANCIAL  
SERVICES LLC and PROTECTIVE  
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants,

and

NATIONAL INTERSTATE INSURANCE  
COMPANY,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 22, 2017

No. 331470

Macomb Circuit Court

LC No. 2014-002726-NI

Before: RIORDAN, P.J., and RONAYNE KRAUSE and SWARTZLE, JJ.

RONAYNE KRAUSE, J. (*concurring*)

I concur in the majority's reasoning and conclusion that plaintiff was an employee rather than an independent contractor, irrespective of plaintiff's expressed opinion to the contrary. A party is entitled to a verdict in their favor if the evidence supports that verdict, even if the party has expressed a contradictory opinion. *Ortega v Lenderink*, 382 Mich 218, 222-223; 169 NW2d 470 (1969). I disagree with the majority's conclusion that any disregard of the corporate form by Tenolli warrants piercing the corporate veil, because I do not perceive the requisite misuse beyond some commingling of identities. See *Green v Ziegelman*, 310 Mich App 436, 450-459; 873 NW2d 794 (2015). However, I concur in the majority's analysis and conclusion that Tenolli, G&T, or an entity combining both could be considered "owners" of the truck under the

no-fault act, and as noted in footnote 3 of the majority opinion, the specific identity of plaintiff's employer does not matter. I respectfully decline to concur in the remainder of the majority's analysis, because I believe doing so is unnecessary to the resolution of this matter.

/s/ Amy Ronayne Krause